

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY

And

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

W.P. No.9660 of 2000

Between:

1. M/s. Chamundeshwari Builders
a Partnership Firm, Rep.by it's Managing Partners
Sri P.Krishna& Sri P.Gopinath,
7-1-64/1 ,Vhamundeshwari Towers,
Dharam Karan Road, Ameerpet,Hyderabad-500 016.
2. Sri P.Krishna, S/o. Sri P.Sailu,
Plot.No.62 ,Text Book Colony, Karkhana,
Secunderabad.
3. Sri P.Gopinath, S/o. Late Sri P.Paiaiah,
H.No.13-4-694, Karwan Sahu, Hyderabad-500 267.

.... PETITIONERS

AND

- 1 The Union of India, Rep. by its Secretary,
Ministry of Food & Consumer Affairs, New Delhi.
- 2 Smt. Kalyani Menon, W/o. Sri Harish Memon,
Flat No.204, Chamundeshwari Towers,
7-1-64/1 ,Vhamundeshwari Towers,
Dharam Karan Road, Ameerpet,Hyderabad-500 016.

....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the

circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an order or direction, more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring Sec.27 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 as arbitrary, unreasonable and violative of Articles 14 & 19 (1) (g) of the Constitution of India , and consequently declare the proceedings in P.P.No.55/99 in C.D.No.1028/94 on the file of the District Form-II, Hyderabad, as void, *ab initio*, null and void and nonest in the eye of law.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR. E.V.S.S. ACHARYULU

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: MR. T. RAMAKRISHNA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: None appeared.

The Court made the following :

ORDER:(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Sudeshan Reddy)

The subject matter that arises for consideration in this Writ Petition is squarely covered by the decision rendered by a Full Bench of this Court in ***C.V. Ratnam v. Union of India & Others.***

Following the decision of the Full Bench, this writ petition is required to be dismissed and the same shall accordingly stand dismissed without any order as to costs.

However, the petitioner shall have the advantage of the observations made in the judgment and the remedy to prefer appeal against the decision of the

District Forum is left open.

B. SUDERSHAN REDDY, J

Date:01-11-2004.

K.C. BHANU, J

PV

To

- 1 The Secretary, Union of India,
Ministry of Food & Consumer Affairs, New Delhi.

- 2. Two C.Ds.

